UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records

FIFTH COMMITTEE
65th meeting
held on
Thursday, 21 May 1992
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 65th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. SPAANS (Netherlands)
(Vice Chairman)

Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions: Mr. MSELLE

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 139: FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS OBSERVER MISSION IN EL SALVADOR (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 148: FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS TRANSITIONAL AUTHORITY IN CAMBODIA (continued)

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

92-55880 5748S (E)

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.5/46/SR.65
28 May 1992

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Spaans (Netherlands), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 139: FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS OBSERVER MISSION IN EL SALVADOR (continued) (A/46/900 and A/46/904; A/C.5/46/L.24)

1. Mr. RAMOS (Spain) briefly introduced the draft resolution on the financing of the United Nations Observer Mission in El Salvador (A/C.5/46/L.24), which was the result of considerable consultation among delegations. The draft resolution took note of the fact that additional payments of assessed contributions had been made since 31 March 1992, the date of the Secretary-General's report, so that the outstanding assessments had been reduced. It also included a decision to the effect that $2 million of the unencumbered balance of appropriation should be retained in the Special Account. Paragraph 8 emphasized the desirability of merging the accounts of the United Nations Observer Group in Central America (ONUCA) and the United Nations Observer Mission in El Salvador (ONUSAL).

2. He commended delegations for their understanding in accepting compromises, so that the draft resolution could be adopted without a vote.

3. Mr. RANDRIAMALALA (Madagascar) pointed out that, in paragraph 6 of its resolution 46/206, the General Assembly had approved the inclusion of five States in the list of least developed countries. He therefore proposed that the following text should be inserted in the draft resolution as a new paragraph 6:

> "Decides to reclassify Cambodia, Madagascar, Zaire and Zambia among the Member States listed in paragraph 3 (d) of resolution 43/232".

The purpose of the amendment was to update the status of those countries with regard to contributions to peace-keeping operations.

4. Mr. HOSANG (Assistant Director, Unit for Peace-keeping Matters and Special Assignments, Office of Programme Planning, Budget and Finance) informed the Committee that the group of countries referred to by the representative of Madagascar was one of four established by the General Assembly for the assessment of contributions to peace-keeping operations. Changes to the category into which a given country fell had in the past been made when the resolution on the relevant appropriations was being considered. It was a matter for Member States to decide.

5. Mr. COHEN (United States of America) said that he believed the procedure suggested by the representative of Madagascar was not the usual one. Changes in a country's classification were usually dealt with under the general item on the financing of peace-keeping operations.

6. Mr. HOSANG (Assistant Director, Unit for Peace-keeping Matters and Special Assignments, Office of Programme Planning, Budget and Finance) agreed, saying that reclassifications had normally been dealt with under the item on the administrative and budgetary aspects of the financing of the United Nations peace-keeping operations. The placement of new Member States, however, had always been done when the General Assembly, at its regular session, considered financing for peace-keeping operations.

7. Mr. DANKWA (Ghana) asked for clarification. He understood that the four groups, for purposes of peace-keeping assessments, were based on the following considerations: the first group consisted of permanent members of the Security Council; the second group, the other developed countries; the third group, developing countries; and the fourth group, the least developed countries. Since the General Assembly had already adopted resolution 46/206 classifying the four countries named as least developed countries, it was a foregone conclusion that they should be included in the fourth group.

8. Mr. CONMY (Ireland) was sympathetic to the position of the representative of Madagascar, but felt that, as classification for purposes of peace-keeping assessments was an important matter that affected the entire scale of assessments, it was inappropriate to deal with it in an ad hoc manner during a resumed session. He recalled that the matter of the assessment for the former Soviet republics had been brought up at a resumed session but had then been deferred until the regular session. The same should be done in the present case, as only the financing of missions was under consideration at the current resumed session.

9. The CHAIRMAN, noting that the Malagasy delegation's proposal had met with sympathy but not concurrence on the part of the Committee, asked that delegation to withdraw it. The General Assembly would at its regular session be considering the assessments of a number of Member States, and Madagascar's concern could be dealt with more appropriately at that time.

10. Mr. DANKWA (Ghana), speaking on a point of order, said that he had asked for clarification from the Secretariat and had not yet received it.

11. Mr. KINCHEN (United Kingdom), noted that the scale of assessments and the apportionment of expenses among the Members under Article 17, paragraph 2, of the Charter had always been a matter of great sensitivity. His delegation understood the position of the representative of Madagascar and, with regard to the concerns of Ghana, asked whether the countries in the fourth group as listed in resolution 43/232 were identical with the least developed countries.

12. Mr. HOSANG (Assistant Director, Unit for Peace-keeping Matters and Special Assignments, Office of Programme Planning, Budget and Finance) said that the classification of a country among the least developed countries did not automatically place it within a given group for purposes of the assessments for peace-keeping operations. Moreover, all the least developed countries did not necessarily belong to the fourth group.

13. Mr. DANKWA (Ghana) asked what was the basis for establishing the groups.

14. Mr. HOSANG (Assistant Director, Unit for Peace-keeping Matters and Special Assignments, Office of Programme Planning, Budget and Finance) said that there had never been a formal basis for the classification, except with respect to the first group, the permanent members of the Security Council. Groupings of Member States had first appeared with resolution 3101 (XXVIII) on the financing of the United Nations Emergency Force. The groupings had since been modified, most recently in connection with the appropriations for the United Nations Transition Assistance Group in resolution 43/232, which itself had then been adjusted several times, as indicated in paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.5/46/L.24.

15. Mr. DANKWA (Ghana) said that if the Secretariat had gone into the legislative history, the reasons for the groupings would have been very clear. The four groups corresponded to permanent members of the Security Council, developed countries, developing countries and least developed countries. If the last named wished to take advantage of that status, that was their privilege.

16. Mr. BAUDOT (Officer-in-charge, Department of Administration and Management) said that, strictly speaking, as with the scale of assessments, the level of wealth of a given country determined its grouping. That principle had never been formally articulated, but resolution 3101 (XXVIII) had taken into account the fact that the economically more developed countries were in a position to make greater contributions. There was, however, no generally accepted scheme for moving from one category to another; each such change required a decision by the General Assembly.

17. Mr. RANDRIAMALALA (Madagascar) drew the Committee's attention to the fact that the classification of Member States into one of the four categories had always been done at meetings on the financing of peace-keeping operations. Thus, resolution 43/232 dealt with the transition period in Namibia and resolution 45/269 with the financing of the United Nations Angola Verification Mission II. It seemed therefore that the current meeting was an appropriate time to deal with his delegation's proposal.

18. Mr. KARBUCZKY (Hungary) said that his delegation was sympathetic to the proposal of the representative of Madagascar, but noted that, in paragraph 9 of the draft resolution under consideration, the contributions of new Member States were referred to and would be established retrospectively by the General Assembly at its forty-seventh session. He wondered whether the same thing could not be done for the reclassification suggested by the delegation of Madagascar.

19. Mr. RAZVIN (Russian Federation) asked the Secretariat what the procedure had been the last time the assessments had been changed.

20. Mr. BOIN (France) said that, as a permanent member of the Security Council, his country understood Ghana's position, but also agreed with the remarks made by the representatives of the United Kingdom and Ireland. The scale of assessments was a very delicate problem and should be considered in greater depth at the forty-seventh session.

21. Mr. HOSANG (Assistant Director, Unit for Peace-keeping Matters and Special Assignments, Office of Programme Planning, Budget and Finance), replying to the representative of Hungary, said that paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.5/46/L.24 stipulated that the rates of assessment for the countries concerned should be adopted at the forty-seventh session. Those countries would also have to be allocated to groups and that decision was the responsibility of the Committee.

22. In reply to the representative of the Russian Federation, he noted that the most recent reclassification had been when Poland had moved from the second group to the third group and Spain had moved from the third group to the second group, over a period of two years. He also pointed out that a number of countries which were not least developed countries were classified in the fourth group and that, in addition to the four countries mentioned by the representative of Madagascar, one other least developed country was classified in the third group.

23. Mr. MORCZYNSKI (Poland) said that, while he sympathized with the position of Madagascar, he wished to point out that Poland's reclassification had involved difficult and lengthy discussions over a period of two years.

24. Mr. RAZVIN (Russian Federation) regretted that the Assistant Director of the Unit for Peace-keeping Matters and Special Assignments had not explained what the procedure for reclassification actually involved and whether the Fifth Committee or the General Assembly was responsible. He agreed with the representative of France that the scale of assessments was an important question requiring the fullest possible consideration. The matter should therefore be held over until the forty-seventh session, when a fair and appropriate solution could be found.

25. Mr. DANKWA (Ghana) said that the basic and underlying consideration should always be the capacity to pay, as reflected by long-term economic conditions. In the present case, the situation was clear. The Committee for Development Planning had decided that the countries concerned should be included in the category of least developed countries and those countries naturally wished to take advantage of that situation. In view of the circumstances, there was no reason why they should be forced to come cap in hand and plead their case. Seeking to make them wait would not enhance their capacity to pay. He therefore wished formally to second the amendment proposed by the representative of Madagascar.

26. The CHAIRMAN said that the meeting would be suspended for 30 minutes so that a solution could be worked out in informal consultations.

The meeting was suspended at 4.10 p.m. and resumed at 4.45 p.m.

27. The CHAIRMAN said that, in the informal consultations, agreement had been reached on a new paragraph to be inserted after paragraph 5 in draft resolution A/C.5/46/L.24, which would read:

> "Requests the Secretary-General to report to the forty-seventh session of the General Assembly on anomalies in the allocation of countries to the four groups contained in General Assembly resolution 43/232, as adjusted by the Assembly in its resolutions 44/192 B, 45/269 and 46/198 A and applied as an ad hoc arrangement to the financing of the United Nations Observer Mission in El Salvador, taking into account Assembly resolution 46/206 of 20 December 1991 and other relevant resolutions of the General Assembly;".

28. Mr. CARDOSO (Brazil) said that, if the Secretary-General was to be asked to report on anomalies, then some kind of yardstick was needed to determine exactly what those anomalies were. He would welcome some clarification on that point.

29. Mr. KINCHEN (United Kingdom) felt that the concern expressed by the representative of Brazil was covered by the reference to "other relevant resolutions of the General Assembly", since, if he remembered correctly, one of the resolutions concerned contained a reference to the capacity to pay. Perhaps the Secretariat could provide confirmation on that point.

30. Mr. BAUDOT (Officer-in-charge, Department of Administration and Management) said that similar requests had been made before and he could assure members of the Committee that the method used to identify anomalies would not be arbitrary.

31. Mr. CARDOSO (Brazil) said that specific terms of reference were still needed. He therefore proposed that the words "having as terms of reference the same criteria established for the four groups in resolution 3101 (XXVIII) of 11 December 1973" should be inserted in the new paragraph.

32. Mr. COHEN (United States of America) said that he was aware of the existence of criteria for the second and third groups but not for the other two groups. He would welcome clarification from the Secretariat as to what those criteria were.

33. Mr. BAUDOT (Officer-in-charge, Department of Administration and Management) agreed that there were no real criteria for the other two groups and suggested that it might be better to use the term "approach".

34. Mr. DANKWA (Ghana) said that the problem could be resolved by adding the words "including resolution 3101 (XXVIII) of 11 December 1973" after the words "other relevant resolutions of the General Assembly" at the end of the proposed new paragraph.

35. Mr. CARDOSO (Brazil) said that he would agree to that proposal.

36. Mr. INOMATA (Japan) said that the resolutions referred to in paragraph 11 of draft resolution A/C.5/46/L.24 did not make any reference to voluntary contributions in cash. The paragraph should therefore be amended to include a reference to resolution 43/230 of 21 December 1988.

37. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to recommend to the General Assembly that it should adopt draft resolution A/C.5/46/L.24, as orally amended.

38. It was so decided.

39. Mrs. EMERSON (Portugal), speaking on behalf of the 12 States members of the European Community, said that the Twelve were pleased that the Committee had recommended the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus. Nevertheless, it would be cause for concern if the practice were to develop of establishing a level of appropriations for peace-keeping operations on the basis of contributions collected.

40. Mr. KINCHEN (United Kingdom) said that the fact that his delegation had not insisted on the application of the provisions of rule 120 of the rules of procedure in the matter before the Committee did not imply that that rule should not normally be heeded.

41. The CHAIRMAN noted that the procedure followed by the Committee in its consideration of the draft resolution before it constituted an exception to rule 120.

AGENDA ITEM 148: FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS TRANSITIONAL AUTHORITY IN CAMBODIA (continued) (A/46/903 and A/46/916; A/C.5/46/L.25)

42. The CHAIRMAN, introducing draft resolution A/C.5/46/L.25, drew the Committee's attention to the fifth preambular paragraph and to paragraphs 4 and 5 relating to the budgetary estimates and to the appropriation in respect of the United Nations Transitional Authority in Cambodia (UNTAC), respectively.

43. A number of delegations had suggested amendments to paragraph 9 of the draft resolution, so that the paragraph would read:

> "Reiterates the need for increased use of civilian personnel in relevant sectors of peace-keeping operations from Governments, as called for in its resolutions 44/192 A of 21 December 1989 and 45/258 of 3 May 1991, and requests the Secretary-General to encourage the participation of such personnel in the Transitional Authority in its civilian components in accordance with the recommendations contained in paragraphs 24 and 25 of the report of the Advisory Committee;".

(The Chairman)

44. Furthermore, he would take it that the Committee wished to amend the draft resolution in line with the amendments adopted in respect of draft resolution A/C.5/46/L.24, by amending the end of paragraph 12 to read "... the procedure established by the General Assembly in its resolutions 43/230 of 21 December 1988, 44/192 A and 45/258", and by inserting a new paragraph 6, to read:

> "Requests the Secretary-General to report to the forty-seventh session of the General Assembly on anomalies in the allocation of countries to the four groups contained in General Assembly resolution 43/232, as adjusted by the Assembly in its resolutions 44/192 B, 45/269 and 46/198 A and applied as an ad hoc arrangement to the financing of the Transitional Authority, taking into account resolution 46/206 of 20 December 1991 and other relevant resolutions of the General Assembly, including resolution 3101 (XXVIII) of 11 December 1973".

45. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to recommend to the General Assembly that it adopt draft resolution A/C.5/46/L.25, as orally amended.

46. It was so decided.

47. Mrs. EMERSON (Portugal), speaking on behalf of the 12 States members of the European Community, said that the Twelve welcomed the consensus on the draft resolution, and reiterated their commitment to the success of the United Nations Transitional Authority in Cambodia, which represented one of the most ambitious peace-keeping operations carried out by the United Nations. Self-determination for the Cambodian people through free elections and full respect for human rights were the fundamental principles for peace in Cambodia. The Twelve hoped that the implementation of the plan would restore peace to Cambodia and contribute to a new era in international relations in South-East Asia.

48. If peace-keeping operations were to succeed, political will must be translated into financial commitment. Member States must pay their assessed contributions in full and on time. Late payments were a breach of the financial obligations of Member States, hindered the Organization's ability to carry out peace-keeping operations, prejudiced its ability to meet its financial obligations to Governments, and placed an unfair burden on those Member States which paid promptly and in full.

49. The CHAIRMAN said that the adoption of the two draft resolutions by consensus demonstrated the Committee's flexibility in dealing with proposals for which it had not been prepared. Nevertheless, the Committee should reflect that the mechanism of informal consultations had served the Committee

(The Chairman)

well over the years; every effort should be made to continue to make use of that mechanism as a tried and tested procedure in considering the weighty matters before it.

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.